

REMARKS

Response to rejections under Section 102:

Examiner continues to assert that the data acquisition unit 16 of Reid can be remote. However, this element is consistently described and shown as local -- even in the lines cited by the Examiner, such as those copied below.

Reid col. 2, lines 34-44: "The present invention provides an entirely new approach to conducting predictive maintenance. The present invention provides a system in which localized experts are provided at various machine sites. The localized experts are automated data collector/analyzers which are configured to acquire and analyze vibration data substantially continuously from one or more machines located at the site. The vibration data is analyzed in real-time and the condition of the machines may be ascertained without reliance on portable data collectors and/or analysis by a system host computer."

Reid's "local expert" is never shown or described as remote. The term "local expert" or "localized expert" is used over 230 times in Reid. His reference numeral "16" appears in the specification 119 times, and every one of those appearances uses the terminology "local expert 16". One could hardly teach away from remote data acquisition and analysis more strongly.

The whole purpose of Reid is to localize data acquisition and analysis as evidenced in the lines above, as opposed to remote analysis. This is the opposite of Applicant's invention, which provides a remote data acquisition unit 17 (FIG 2) that centrally collects data from multiple remote sites, and a remote analysis unit 25 that centrally analyzes the collected data. Applicant's independent claims 6 and 12 recite a diagnostics system configured to access and diagnose a plurality of remote stationary power stations, by means of "an acquisition unit remote from at least one of the stationary power stations for collecting measurement data detected by sensors in the power stations" (claim 6) or "an acquisition unit and a server unit receiving the collected measurement data via the internet from each power station server (claim 12).

Examiner now holds in the final action of 09-25-2007 that element 34 of Reid corresponds to Applicants' data acquisition unit of claims 6 and 12. This is a new ground for rejection, since it was not mentioned before, and because Reid's "central monitoring location 34" is a different element functionally than the previously cited "localized experts 16". The two elements 16 and 34 of Reid are not interchangeable alternatives. The local experts 16 collect and analyze data locally. A central monitoring location 34 optionally monitors and controls the local experts. If there is any correspondence to Reid's element 34 in the present application, it would be Applicants' client computer 15, not the data acquisition unit 17 of Applicants' FIG 2.

However, the correspondence does not hold, because in Reid, the data is collected for each local site by a local data collection and analysis unit 16. However, in Applicant's invention of FIG 2, this function is done centrally for a plurality of remote power stations. The advantage is that a client 15 in Applicants' invention can obtain data from all sites by a standard internet connection to a single memory unit 20. In contrast, the central monitoring location 34 of Reid (FIG 1) can only obtain data from one site 12 at a time.

Reid col. 7, lines 48-56: "Furthermore, the central monitoring location 34 is configured to control the local experts 16 via the DUN [dial-up network] or VPN [virtual private network] , for example, and is thus capable of performing real time analysis of data collected by a given local expert 16. As is discussed in more detail below, a local expert 16 can replicate the vibration data obtained from one or more of the machines 14 into the database of the central monitoring location 34. More experienced personnel at the central monitoring location 34 can then review the vibration data."

Conclusion

For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, a reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present (MPEP 706.02(a) IV). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as recited in the claim, and the elements must be arranged as required by the claim (MPEP §2131). These criteria are not met by Reid, as argued above. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 102 rejections. Applicants feel this application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/21/07

By: 

John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830